

From: Dan Derby
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/26/02 2:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I feel I've been victimized by Microsoft's monopolistic practices, not only in paying more than a product is worth, but also in seeing the entire computer OS platform I use become ineffective. I purchased MS Office when it was only offered for the Mac (version 3) and was satisfied with the product. However, after MS launched Windows, the next upgrade to Office (Version 4) didn't work as advertised, and interfered with Mac operating system -- causing countless crashes (I believe MS Office Manager never worked and was never fixed). This sudden 'breaking' of a product originally designed for the Mac but continued to work well on their new Windows OS, implies the company did it damage Apple.

Beside defrauding me out of \$600, the failure of this program suite to work properly on the Mac, I believe, drove the Mac out of the business and government environments. This loss of market caused my investment in Apple products to become less effective as well. I also believe Apple was unable to protest for fear of further losing MS productivity suite support.

While I sincerely feel this is an obvious example of MS's unethical and probably illegal practices. I'm also convinced the proposed settlement gives MS a boost in the education market, again at Apples expense.

I have a much simpler settlement: Enforce the government's policy of not allowing sole source purchases. Simply limit MS's total share of any one type of software suite (OS, Web browser, productivity apps, etc) to less than 50% of US government purchases. In fact the US government should never allow any company to control more than 50% of any commonly used software genre owned by the government. WHY AREN'T SOLE SOURCE RULES APPLIED TO MICROSOFT? CAN THE GOVERNMENT DEFEND IT PURCHASING PATTERNS in light of the court ruling?

Dan Derby
----- End of Forwarded Message